

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Appeal Decision mailed on June 16th, 2008.

Claims 4, 8-9, 11, 17 and 20 are amended, claim 6-7, 10 and 21-34 are canceled, and claims 35-50 are added; as a result, claims 1-5, 8-9, 11-20 and 35-50 are now pending in this application. Support for added claims 35-50 can be found throughout the specification, but at least in Figs. 1-3 and pp. 4, 9 and 12-16.

### **Appeal Response**

The Appeal Decision states in multiple sections that Applicant's arguments were broader than the claim language. In response, Applicant has amended claim 4 to clarify the claim language by, in part, including features of "providing first and second user authentication methods, wherein the first user authentication method is an authentication method selected from authentication methods based on what a user knows and authentication methods based on a characteristic of the user and the second user authentication is based on a token distributed to the user" and "if the user is successfully authenticated at the first web site, enabling the communication of token-based authentication data corresponding to the token from the first web site to a second web site using the internet, the authentication data including a token code." Applicant has examined the communicated references and submits that the references are silent as to the recited features of claim 4. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is allowable. Claims 5, 8-9, 11-13, and 16-20 depend from claim 4. As such claim 5, 8-9, 11-13, and 16-20 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 4.

### **New Claims**

Added claim 35 states, in part, a feature of "connecting the service web site to a security web site; configuring the service web site to add a second factor authentication to the first factor authentication, wherein configuring includes adapting the service web site to forward data corresponding to the second factor authentication to the security web site and to receive a authentication result from the security web site." Applicant has examined the communicated references and submits that the references are silent as to at the recited features of claim 35. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 35 is allowable. Claims 36-41

depend from claim 35. As such claims 36-41 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 35.

Added claim 42 states, in part, a feature of “receive, from the user, a service request, wherein the service request includes data corresponding to a first authentication factor of the user and data corresponding to a second authentication factor of the user, wherein the second authentication factor is different from the first authentication factor.” Applicant has examined the communicated references and submits that the references are silent as to at the recited features of claim 42. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 42 is allowable. Claims 43-48 depend from claim 42. As such claims 43-48 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 35.

Added claim 49 states, in part, a feature of “if the authorization at the second website is successful, transmitting data to the first web site indicating the user has been successfully authenticated using at least two factors of authentication, wherein the user is granted access to web content on the first web site only if the user has been authenticated using at least two factors of authentication.” Applicant has examined the communicated references and submits that the references are silent as to at the recited features of claim 49. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 49 is allowable.

Added claim 50 states, in part, a feature of “if the authorization at the authorization website is successful, transmitting data to the first web site indicating the user has been successfully authenticated using at least two factors of authentication, wherein the user is granted access to web content on the plurality of web sites only if the user has been authenticated using at least two factors of authentication.” Applicant has examined the communicated references and submits that the references are silent as to at the recited features of claim 50. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 50 is allowable.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant’s attorney (612) 373-6909 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SEAN BRENNAN

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 373-6909

Date August 18, 2008

By Thomas F. Brennan  
Thomas F. Brennan  
Reg. No. 35,075

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 18 day of August, 2008.

Zhakalazky M. Carrion

Name

Zhakalazky M. Carrion  
Signature